To change everything, it takes everyone: recursivity in the People's Climate March

Danielle Falzon, Samuel Maron, Robert Wengronowitz, Alex Press, Benjamin Levy, Jeffrey Juris

Abstract

The People's Climate March (PCM) in September 2014 brought hundreds of thousands of people into the streets of New York City in an unprecedented outpouring of support for action on climate change. With so much momentum behind it, the PCM made possible related events before and after the March itself. As activists and academics, we discuss the March weekend from the pre-march Climate Convergence to the post-march Flood Wall Street protest. We argue that the March weekend brought together a diversity of historically fragmented climate movement actors to recursively strategize the future of the climate movement. This happened through: 1) an open-source model of workshops and panels at the pre-March events; 2) The unbranded and segmented structure of the PCM; 3) the lack of a target; 4) an outlet for radical activists; 5) and a series of incidental contexts opening space for individuals to connect. In deliberately working toward inclusivity, the PCM and the events of the surrounding weekend facilitated simultaneous critique and negotiation of the climate movement's future.

Keywords: climate change, climate movement, People's Climate March, recursivity, performance, justice, social movements, environment

Introduction

"BREAKING: Initial count for the People's Climate March: 310,000. Thank you all for being part of a beautiful, historic day." The text message came just before 3:00 pm the day of the People's Climate March (PCM). We looked at each other in awe: this was an unparalleled public assertion of concern about human-caused climate change, its effects, and the need to take action. Though we had all taken part in other marches before, the size of the PCM and diversity of participants made this action unique. This was an historic moment for the climate movement.

The PCM took place on Sunday, September 21, 2014 in New York City. Popularized by the organizations 350.org and Avaaz.org (Petermann 2014; see also McKibben 2014), the event was joined by the Climate Justice Alliance—a broad coalition of "frontline" communities and movement organizations—among hundreds of other organizations and individuals, and blossomed into a forum for debate within the climate movement. The term "frontline" has been used by the climate movement to signal those peoples most likely to bear the brunt of the effects of climate change, but who often bear the least responsibility

for contributing to climate change. Though originally planned as a singular event, the PCM quickly evolved into a weekend full of activities (hereafter the "March weekend") that brought thousands of people to the same place to fight climate change and address the wide-ranging connected issues. We divide this weekend into three parts: (1) pre-March activities, in particular the Climate Convergence conference focusing on "tackling global warming from the bottom up" that took place September 19-20; (2) the People's Climate March on September 21; and (3) post-March activities, specifically Flood Wall Street (FWS), which concentrated on connecting capitalism to climate change, on September 22.

In this paper, we suggest that the PCM was a critical moment for the climate movement. As a movement that has been fractured along lines of various constituencies, geographic locations, and proposed solutions, the climate movement has struggled to come together to form a unified message and effect change (Endres et al. 2009, Hadden 2015, Kinsella and Cox 2009). The organizers of the PCM—especially the "host committee" discussed below— recognized this fractured history and deliberately worked, through inclusive planning, to bring divided groups together (Robbins 2014). In doing so, they produced conversations and debates regarding not only the effectiveness of the PCM as a tactic, but about the future of the climate movement as a whole. These dynamics involved a process of recursivity and the constitution of a recursive movement public. Social movement recursivity involves an ongoing process of active self-reflection, debate, and widespread participation in the process of movement-building to understand and shape the movement's current and future shape and trajectory. This recursivity simultaneously gives rise to, and occurs within, a recursive public (Kelty 2008), a public constituted through discourse about its own conditions of possibility, which, in the context of a social movement can be embodied through the intentional and engaged presence of collective actors during protests, actions, and other movement gatherings.

More generally, according to Michael Warner (2002), a public is a "space of discourse organized by nothing other than discourse itself" (413). It brings together strangers in personal and impersonal ways, and is "constituted through mere attention" (419). Ultimately, a public "is the social space created by the reflexive circulation of discourse" (420). Publics act historically, but only through the continual circulation of discourse. Moreover, publics involve "poetic world-making," the conjuring of the world "in which it attempts to circulate" through public address (422). In this sense, a movement public is constituted through the circulation of discourse by and about the movement itself. Such a movement public is recursive to that extent that it addresses the conditions of possibility of the movement, whether technological, organizational, social-structural, financial, etc. A recursive social movement public thus creates the conditions of possibility for ongoing discursive exchange among movement actors, which allows for further movement organizing. Movement publics become periodically embodied during mass protests and actions, and their discursivity can become embodied to the extent that the

ultimate shape and organization of the protest comes to reflect the outcome of movement discussion and debate about the constitution and underlying organizational, social, and infrastructural conditions of the protest and the relationship between diverse protest actors. A recursive public is distinct from the concept of "free spaces," which Evans and Boyte (1992) describe as physical places where individuals can connect with the political and both discover and produce shared understandings of domination and injustice (Polletta 1999). Rather than physical institutional "free spaces," we view the temporally bounded, and thus ephemeral, nature of a recursive public to be central to its constructive power, where people on the margins of the climate movement can participate in re-thinking the movement as a whole.

In this paper we specifically argue that the PCM physically embodied a recursive public composed of a diversity of historically fragmented actors, divided along axes of social composition (race, class, etc.) as well as political tactics and ideology. This embodied social movement public was recursive in that the March represented the outcome of a great deal of argumentation and debate about the nature of the movement, not just its social composition and political ideology, but also the very organizational and infrastructural foundation. In this sense, as an embodied recursive public the PCM helped to create the conditions of possibility for ongoing discussion, strategizing, and debate within and about the climate movement, which can ultimately lead to subsequent organizing, protesting, and movement building.

Background

The climate movement's history and internal divisions reveal the strategic importance of recursivity. The movement definitively emerged in the late 1980s alongside the growth in international awareness about the issue of climate change and a pressing need to take action (Kendall et al. 1992). Early on, the movement was led by the Climate Action Network (CAN), which sought to push climate change to the forefront of the United Nations agenda (Hadden 2015). The efforts of CAN contributed to the 1992 UN Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, which created the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the continued negotiations at annual COP (Conference of the Parties) meetings to continue addressing the issue of climate change. This includes the 1997 COP in Kyoto, which led to a legally binding set of landmark requirements for reducing carbon emissions— though largely considered unsuccessful due to lack of accountability mechanisms and the refusal of the United States to participate (Ciplet, Roberts, and Khan 2015), and the more recent Paris Agreement that entered into force in November 2016.

During the Kyoto deliberations, divisions became evident in CAN, as some activists began to question the organization's commitment to scientific arguments and its reliance on the U.N. to enact and enforce change (Hadden 2015). Although the climate movement remained intact, a clear faction emerged that sought to link the climate movement and global justice struggles. These

justice-oriented organizers put together the first Climate Justice Summit in The Hague in 2000 and formed the Durban Group for Climate Justice in 2004. This set the stage for the annual tradition of large-scale protest outside COP meetings to pressure for real action toward climate justice.

By the 2007 COP meeting in Bali, a coalition of more radical organizations called Climate Justice Now! (CJN) had formed in order to incorporate social, ecological, and gender justice under the climate change banner (Bond 2010, Hadden 2015). This group drew from the global justice movement, especially the anti-globalization movement, which had seen success in Seattle less than a decade earlier (see Juris 2008a). The movement became further divided at the now infamous 2009 COP 15 meeting in Copenhagen. A chasm grew wider between mainstream and radical approaches, such as between traditional lobbying and advocacy groups (like CAN and Global Campaign for Climate Action), and those more focused on direct action and civil disobedience (such as Climate Justice Now! and Climate Justice Action) (Hadden 2015). Throughout the conference these groups were in conflict and could not bridge their differences, which weakened the public voice at Copenhagen. The resulting Copenhagen Accord, pushed through by a powerful group of nations, reinforced existing power imbalances between the Global North and South, and further marginalized developing nations (Mukhopadhyay 2009).

Despite a growing awareness of how climate change relates to global and environmental justice, there are still critical fractures in the climate movement involving divisions between groups. These include indigenous and minority communities who are most acutely threatened by climate change; youth who must live with the destructive decisions of the past; anti-capitalists who attribute climate change primarily to growth under capitalism; engineers who seek to build technological solutions; and conservationists who center their work on specific phenomena such as biodiversity loss or deforestation. Chatterton, Featherstone, and Routledge (2013:613) use the case of Copenhagen to suggest the climate movement may actually be something more like a "range of overlapping, interacting, competing, differentially placed and resourced, and often divergent networks concerned with issues of climate change." These different climate movement actors exist on unequal planes of power, and while their environmental concerns overlap, their strategic and ideological perspectives often do not. Indeed, as we highlight below, the PCM was explicitly designed to allow for all groups and individuals to locate their place within a broad conceptualization of climate change. The PCM not only brought together diverse parts of the climate movement, it spotlighted those groups that have been historically excluded and marginalized, such as indigenous peoples.

We describe the different components of the March weekend in greater ethnographic detail in the following sections, but it is important to note here how the events came together. The People's Climate March was called for and primarily funded by the climate NGO 350.org and progressive NGO Avaaz. However, much of the organizing work was done by a "host committee." According to Tomás Garduño, the political director of The Alliance for a Greater

New York (ALIGN), decisions regarding messaging, date, and route were all decided by the host committee (personal email communication, September 17, 2014). This committee was co-convened by Garduño and Eddie Bautista from the NYC-EJA (New York City Environmental Justice Alliance). For at least six months leading up to the PCM, the host committee, facilitated by ALIGN and NYC-EJA, participated in weekly calls with a broader group drawing from more than 100 organizations.

The March was organized into six sections that deliberately incorporated groups and sectors that had previously participated in climate actions: from frontline communities to students, scientists, and anarchists. As it became clear that the PCM was attracting mass participation, the two organizations, System Change Not Climate Change and Global Climate Convergence, organized a conference of panel discussions and meetings called the Climate Convergence that would be held throughout New York City during the weekend of the March. These sessions focused on social justice and environmental issues, and were planned by individuals and a wide variety of organizations. Finally, more radical-leaning climate activists—many with histories in Occupy Sandy, Occupy Wall Street, and the Global Justice movement (Cohen 2017, Robbins 2014)—coordinated Flood Wall street for the day after the March, a direct action intending to connect climate change to capitalism and satisfy those who felt the March lacked targeted direction. In organizing the events surrounding the March, it was clear that the entire PCM mobilization were meant to be deliberately inclusive and to harness the energy of all parts of the climate movement, something that was critical to addressing the existing divisions.

This inclusivity and purposeful organizing resulted in a specific kind of public. Different from a Harbermasian public centered in rational discourse, exchange, and debate, the PCM was both deliberative and performative, while reflecting Kelty's (2008) conception of a recursive public: "a public that is vitally concerned with the material and practical maintenance and modification of the technical, legal, practical, and conceptual means of its own existence as a public." This involved ongoing discussions and debates regarding the PCM's composition, as well as its underlying material and organizational infrastructure. Indeed, as Nancy Fraser (1992) argues, publics are riven with internal hierarchies, exclusions, and relations of power, including micro-level cultural-political struggles. When internal debates and struggles are primarily focused on the nature of the public itself—its definition, its membership, its structure, its funding—they work to constitute a recursive public. This recursive public exists primarily to discuss and debate its own conditions of possibility both presently and going forward. A recursive public references itself not only through internal debates and micro-level interactions, but also in how it presents itself to an external audience. For example, the numerous critiques of the March written before the weekend (elaborated in the next section) were addressed by public speakers and explicitly cited in conversations many of us had throughout the weekend. We argue that this cycle of recursivity was one of the most distinctive aspects of the weekend, and its infusion into many of the interactions we had with participants and the speeches we heard at panels

before the March speaks to its centrality as a characteristic of the PCM.

The recursivity of the PCM can also be seen in its performative dimension (see Wengronowitz 2014). Performances communicate verbal and nonverbal messages to an audience, linking image to emotion through embodied performance (Baumann 1977; Beeman 1993). This performative aspect distinguishes a recursive public from other strategically self-critical movement formations such as horizontalism or those that exclusively emphasize internal reflexivity. Recursive movement publics rely on and generate publicity, projecting ideas and debates internally, but also outward toward an external audience. The PCM was a performance that not only facilitated networked connections between diverse parts of the climate movement but also "sketched them out," representing and physically manifesting such connections and communicating them, both to an emerging recursive global climate justice movement public and to a larger audience (see Juris 2008b). This communication was effective, as can be seen in the frequent post-PCM comments that "you can't say no one cares about climate change anymore." It is this achievement—a change in public discourse that came from images of hundreds of thousands of people marching through the streets of New York City—that points us to the centrality of this performance of the PCM as an embodied recursive public.

Recursivity is integral to building a movement, as it allows a movement to reflect on its strengths and weaknesses and to intentionally deliberate regarding diverse avenues toward potential futures. What occurred at the PCM, however, was something more, involving widespread participation, deliberation, and public action to address movement-wide tensions and divisions that could only have occurred in the context of the large-scale internal and external publics that were generated on the streets of New York. On the other hand, recursivity and the PCM as an embodied recursive public are not panaceas. Larger organizations with more power—resources, connections, high status actors, etc.—maintain their ability to set agendas and drive the movement. It is also important to point out that recursivity itself does not encompass decision-making. Few decisions about the strategy and direction of the climate movement were or could be made during the PCM mobilization. Indeed, publics involve the circulation of discourse and are constituted through the act of collective attention. A public itself does not act or decide, but rather calls into a being a collective actor or series of collective actors that can subsequently take action and make strategic decisions. In this sense, during the PCM itself no specific decisions could be made about future targets, particular places to focus energy, or in determining singular approaches that would reverse climate change. However, the generation and embodiment of a massive, broad, and diverse recursive public during the March energized the movement and facilitated the communicative interactions that were able to bring together the diverse constituencies of the movement, while connecting grassroots actors to movement leadership. The process and experience of coming together as a recursive public boosted energy and generated feelings of power and inclusion that has the potential to invigorate the networks and ongoing interactions

between different groups through which future strategic discussion, decision-making, and movement-building can happen.

In what follows, we identify five elements that reflect the nature of the PCM as a recursive public: 1) The open-source model of workshops and panels during the pre-March events; 2) The unbranded and segmented structure of the March itself; 3) The March's lack of a concrete target; 4) The provision of a communicative and performative space for radical activists during and after the March; 5) And the existence of myriad forums for incidental connections and communication throughout the entire PCM weekend. We argue that these five recursive and performative elements constituted the PCM as an embodied recursive public, which ultimately made it a critical moment in the development of the climate movement.

Methods

We conducted a collaborative ethnographic study of the PCM weekend in New York City from September 19-22, 2014. We divided up in order to participate in and observe as many different events and spaces as possible, while intermittently coming together to collectively reflect, and then separate again, as a way to gain a broad perspective on the different PCM-related activities and protests taking place around New York City. This process also included collaborative writing in which we all contributed to recording our observation, analysis, and generating our argument. Our data come from our observations, from field notes written during and after the weekend, from social and mainstream media, and from audio and video recordings and photographs. We systematically compiled and analyzed these data, and then wrote the paper collectively using the Google Docs shared online editing platform.

As a group of activists and academics based in Boston, we attended the PCM as participant observers. As other ethnographic research has shown (Scheper-Hughes, 1993, Juris and Khasnabish 2013), this approach can provide insight not necessarily accessible from the sidelines, as was the case for our engagement in the weekend's events. We marched for miles, stayed up all night to help paint banners, and took on legally and physically risky positions during the Flood Wall Street action.

Throughout the weekend, we simultaneously played activist and researcher roles. For example, several of us contributed to deliberations during the Flood Wall Street (FWS) action. However, our observations were restricted to the weekend itself, in that none of our research team played a role in organizing the March or its surrounding events. This reflects a persistent issue in studying social movements ethnographically: the need to be in the right place at the right time and involved in the early planning stages to capture all details. Ultimately, our argument is focused on the events of the March weekend and not in the planning that produced it.

Additionally, our individual backgrounds informed our observations and understanding of the PCM and the weekend's other events. Each of us possesses

diverse histories of activism, having participated in various social movements. We supported the aims of the March and the movement for climate justice, and all believe in the need for stronger global efforts to address climate change. We have all previously attended other large demonstrations and actions, which allowed us to participate in the PCM with perspective and a reliable set of expectations of what it would entail. This allowed us to look beyond the uniqueness of protest and focus on how the events related to expectations and norms of movement activities.

Our fieldwork took place in New York City, New York. Most of the weekend's activities, including the March itself, occurred near Central Park, in midtown, and in lower Manhattan. Workshops and activist spaces also hosted related events in Brooklyn. Events were held in spaces owned by universities, religious groups, and other social justice organizations. We spread out during the weekend, attending events around the city and observing the March and its participants on the streets, in the subway, and in many spaces in between.

Before the People's Climate March

In the weeks and months leading up to the PCM there were steady debates about the utility, purpose, and strategy of the March that occurred primarily online in activist and environmentalist media outlets, op-ed pages, and on social media. Many agreed that no, this event would not solve the global crisis of climate change, but yes, we must go anyway, mostly occurring within the climate movement but with contributors from outside as well. Broadly, these critiques can be divided into liberal and radical perspectives on the goals and strategies of the climate movement, and accompanying opinions about the effectiveness of mass marches in general and this one in particular that did not have clear political demands or a specific centralized message. From the everyday conversations among activists to the formal panel discussions with elite movement leaders and political figures, the debates around the PCM attempted to critically address problems in the movement and identify ways of solving them. In this section, we show our experiences at workshops in the two days before the March that, importantly, were organized in an open-source model allowing diverse participation.

At the Climate Convergence on September 19th and 20th, indigenous activists and speakers from the Global South drew lines of connection from their struggles to movements in the North, calling for greater solidarity as part of a common struggle. At a panel the next night, prominent speakers and politicians voiced their concerns over the strategy of the March, engaging in a debate about the climate movement that had begun months before. Representing both liberal and radical wings of the ongoing debates, these two events highlight the power the March had to bridge different sectors of the climate movement, bringing together activists, everyday people, and elites.

There were dozens of events in the first days of the PCM weekend, including the formal and informal, from big environmental NGO workshops to individual

speakers. At an event hosted by Rainforest Action Network on Friday, September 19, for example, we listened to speakers discuss corporate finance in climate change to a crowd that seemed to mostly fit the traditional older white environmentalist profile. Later that evening, a notably more racially diverse crowd filled St. Peter's Church for the opening plenary of the Climate Convergence that included Bolivian water rights activist Oscar Olivera, Philippine labor organizer Josua Mata, Idle No More's Erica Violet Lee, the hip-hop activist Immortal Technique, Global Justice Ecology Project's Anne Petermann, and New York City organizer Nastaran Mohi. The plenary reflected an increasingly common goal among U.S. grassroots movements to ensure that marginalized "frontline communities" that are most affected by an issue are afforded visibility and leadership roles within movement spaces. This builds on similar strategies within environmental and global justice movements (see Juris 2008a).

Indigenous rights organizer Erica Violet Lee explained that many people within their movement "don't think of themselves as activists," and asserted that they are "protectors, not protesters." This reframing of activist identities allowed her to assert the need for acknowledgement of the differences in worldview of those united to fight for climate justice. Drawing connections across movements, Lee dedicated a closing poem to a Palestinian woman, her words lingering in the air as she walked back to her seat on the stage. These speakers worked to connect the environmentalists who had converged in New York City with those who have historically been far from the concern of the US environmental movement, and this theme became acute with one of the final speakers.

When his turn came, Oscar Olivera stepped to the front of the stage. A leader of the Cochabamba, Bolivia "water wars," Olivera (2004) had been the head of the Cochabamba Federation of Factory Workers at the time of water privatizations. He began, "I come from the South to the North to act as a bridge." He spoke to a pervasive theme of the weekend: climate change is too great a challenge for the U.S. environmental movement alone. By beginning his speech with this statement, Olivera implied that those in the Global South were in strong agreement that historic fractures in the climate movement must be repaired.

"We in the South have been victim to a huge dispossession," he continued. "And for 500 years, we've resisted. We are here to look each other in the eyes. We face the biggest obstacle yet: climate change. It's almost invisible, it's hard for us to notice." Admonishing the scientism that some within the movement have relied upon (Boykoff 2011, Moore et al. 2011), Olivera urged a reframing of the argument for action to achieve climate justice. "People will understand climate change if we state that it means scarcity of resources and water. We need to frame this as: rivers dry up, lands become contaminated, that their animals start dying, that their loved ones get cancer. That's what climate change is." Moving so quickly that the translator stopped him for clarification, Olivera jumped to a theme that would arise repeatedly throughout the weekend: "How are we going to organize ourselves?"

Answering his own question, Olivera described the horizontal nature of

organizing in Cochabamba. Echoing Raúl Zibechi's (2005) writings on the extra-state or semi-autonomous nature of recent Bolivian struggles, he spoke of the eight days in April 2000, where in Cochabamba, there "was no governor, no military, no police, no party," but rather, "the power was in the people." This explicit weighing of organizing models and framing came up throughout the weekend, in different rooms, streets, and late-night conversations. Such an orientation generates a continuous recursivity, an ongoing reflection and debate about the organizational infrastructure that makes the movement possible. This was visible through speeches such as those given by Olivera. Ending his speech with a rejection of the historic North/South divide, Olivera asserted that "Cochabamba is in Detroit right now," a reference to that city's ongoing water shut offs that have left poor residents without access to water, and in doing so further troubled the categories long taken for granted within the US environmental movement (see Martinez-Alier 2003, Guha and Martinez-Alier 2013).

With the energy that can come from nearly non-stop activist events, lack of sleep did not stop us from observing many panels, sessions, and workshops at the Climate Convergence. Topics ranged from action planning to decolonization and Marxist ecology to peace and climate intersections. On Saturday evening, we hurried toward a much anticipated panel: "The Climate Crisis: Which Way Out?" Judging by the size of the crowd of people who were unable to enter the at-capacity event, this was clearly the evening's hot ticket, involving a discussion between some of the key public figures in the burgeoning climate justice scene: Bill McKibben, Naomi Klein, Chris Hedges, Kshama Sawant, and Bernie Sanders. We were intrigued about how participants might address the increasingly rancorous debate surrounding Chris Hedges' (2014) critique of the March and call for more direct action.

The panel made clear how much the March itself—as an expression of the broader climate movement—had become the subject of critical reflection and debate: on its meaning, structural foundations, boundaries, as well as strategic benefits and shortcomings. Many of the March's radical critics cited its lack of political direction and its ties with corporate and state institutions. In the lead-up to the PCM, journalist Christopher Hedges (2014) published a widely read critique of the March in which he said it would be a "climate-themed street fair," censured its cooperation with police, and condemned its lack of demands. In the weeks following Hedges' missive, a number of similar critiques of the March appeared. For instance, Saul (2014) argued that the March was fundamentally devoid of politics. Just two days before the event, Gupta (2014) concluded that while he intended to participate in the PCM, it amounted to little more than a marketing campaign.

However, not everyone agreed with these radical critics, many of whom rejected the March's tactics in favor of direct action or the construction of self-sufficient local communities. More moderate perspectives, such as that of Salamon (2014), contended that these radical strategies were inadequate to the task of massively reducing carbon emissions. Such an outcome would require

centralized mobilization requiring big government, which itself necessitated a powerful campaign encompassing large swaths of American society. She put forth an opposing argument, asserting that the March's lack of demands was of benefit, and that "the organizers of the PCM have allowed the marchers to speak for themselves — to make the march, and the actions that will follow it— their own." These debates hinged on two longstanding questions within social movements: what is the purpose of demonstrations, and are they effective?

At the panel, Hedges addressed the March's relation to direct action, saying "I want to talk a little bit about power and why this march...has to be seen as the prelude to resistance." For him, the March was important in terms of its "capacity to radicalize certain people, to make them ask questions about systems of power that maybe they haven't asked before," working to bridge the radical and liberal wings of the movement in order to move forward together. McKibben and Klein articulated similar views. Klein focused on the network connections facilitated by the March. McKibben recognized that the March is not solely sufficient, but that it allowed diverse movements and groups that have been organizing around climate justice for some time to come together and build solidarity and a sense of empowerment. In this sense, recognizing the critical emotional dynamics of mass protests (see Juris 2008b; Goodwin et al. 2001), McKibben suggested that we "take [our] frustration and anger and mix it with the joy and hope of rubbing shoulders with hundreds of thousands of other people...and make change fast." The ultimate goal is thus to build a larger and more sustainable movement.

We wondered about critiques of the PCM while riding the subway at the end of the night where we spotted an ad that read, "What puts hipsters and bankers in the same boat?" followed by the command to "March." Did the ad reflect oversized influence of the well-funded organizations like 350.org, Greenpeace, and Avaaz or was it simply a case of skilled organizers leveraging resources to reach as many people as possible?

Hours later, the man directing our painting of a parachute to be displayed at the March the next day, a long-time radical activist who had spent the previous few weeks creating signs, puppets, and other protest art in this warehouse offered his opinion on the tension. Addressing us as we took a break to let our knees recover from kneeling on the concrete floor, the organizer broke the silence between us. He understood the critiques—such as those from Hedges (2014) and Gupta (2014)—of larger environmental groups like Greenpeace, but he noted how they fund the infrastructure that allowed grassroots movements to organize themselves, facilitating the open model of the March. This organizer did not summarize the critiques to us and instead treated them as background knowledge for any and all participants in the art space. Such an interaction was evidence of the recursivity that pervaded our interactions that weekend and the existence of a recursive climate movement public, which would become embodied over the coming days. Indeed, during this exchange, we evaluated the movement's tactics and goals, while focusing our attention, and those around us, on the nature and composition of the PCM as well as the future of the

climate movement.

We have thus far highlighted some of the critiques and debates that lead up to the March. Throughout the weekend, we heard similar conversations repeatedly in the streets, and they came from people at all levels of involvement in the climate movement. Such discussions illustrated the existence of a recursive climate movement public that came into being through debates about the PCM itself, including its underlying meaning, its social and political boundaries, and its underlying material and organizational infrastructure. We now turn to the March itself, where this recursive public would be performed and embodied.

The March: "People power in full bloom"

"Shhhh, shhhhh!" The sound spread through the multitude as thousands raised their hands and fell silent. All at once the crowd, which had been abuzz with conversation and speculations about when we might start marching after waiting for several hours, stood quietly in remembrance of those who were already victims of climate change. Standing there, those affected by sea level rise, extreme storms, droughts, and resource depletion passed through our minds. These thoughts were broken when, moments later, the assembled marchers sounded the "climate alarm" by breaking into a cacophony of shouts, whoops, and yells intended to demand the attention and to alert the world to the effects of climate change. It was a moment emblematic of the performance of the March as it audibly demonstrated the strength of the collective voice advocating for action on climate change. It can also be seen as a result of the organizers' internal recursivity and deliberations as such a demonstration brought together the historically divided factions of the climate movement together in a single, unified act.

Three elements of the PCM reflect its constitution as a recursive public and its subsequent embodiment. First, the March was structured so that the full diversity of the climate movement was present and visible, but also so that marginalized groups were specifically highlighted. This structure was part of the organizers' goal of purposeful inclusivity and facilitated the performance of a united but differentiated movement. Second, the March had no explicit demands or targets. It had been deliberately scheduled to coincide with the UN climate summit meeting, but the March itself aimed only to put out a broad call for global action to address climate change. This allowed all participants to freely express their interests, opinions, and connections on climate-related issues and make them known in their own ways. Third, discussion and debate occurred during the incidental periods of the PCM, especially in the hours waiting to start marching due to the enormity of the crowd. These three components highlighted recursivity in that they outlined specific organizational and political conditions of possibility for the movement itself, conditions that included the highlighting of the world's most vulnerable and marginalized populations, thereby opening the space both literally and figuratively for a wide variety of perspectives and voices and allowing for these conversations to take

place within the March itself. These elements and the performance of movement debates and diversity to a broader public constituted the PCM as an embodied recursive public, which allowed it become a critical moment for the climate movement.

We arrived at the March on Sunday, September 21, and spread out between 65th Street and 86th Street on Central Park West. The March was organized into six segments that matched prominent parts of the movement. From front to back, with short notes of the primary participants in each section: Frontlines of Crisis, Forefront of Change (communities of color and environmental justice groups); We Can Build the Future (labor, students, families); We Have Solutions (environmental groups); We Know Who Is Responsible (anti-corporate and other protest groups); The Debate Is Over (science and interfaith groups); To Change Everything, We Need Everyone (a catchall to include everyone else). This structure provided a visual narrative for onlookers, media, and institutional power-holders at the United Nations. Featured in the front were those with the most at stake in climate change policymaking, following them were groups looking to the future and building solutions, then those identifying the culprits of climate change and definitively ending any debates about it, and then finally everyone else supporting the movement in the back. Rather than solely embracing the diversity of the movement, the structure announced it, performing and communicating the message that people from very different backgrounds and with their own preferred reasons for being present had come together to demand climate action. While this allowed for the presence of a variety of perspectives, the spatial demarcation of different narratives also prevented some inter-group discourse that may have occurred otherwise.

The PCM's size created a context where long periods of waiting facilitated important exchanges among participants. Though the March was meant to begin at 11:30, only the very front could begin moving at that time. The large number of participants meant space was filled as the March moved forward and so it took hours for everyone to begin marching. The long wait allowed for conversation, sharing of songs, and relationship building. For example, one group called the People's Climate March Music Bloc facilitated singing by passing out lyrics. Pointing to the recursive public created at the March, one of the songs (Ain't Gonna Let Nobody Turn me Around) inspired a conversation around the appropriateness of a Black Freedom song in the climate movement. The March delay also allowed for debate over the March's structure and effectiveness.

Since the appearance of the March was so important to conveying the complexity of climate movement to the outside public, we found a perch on the corner of 59th Street and 6th Avenue from which to observe the full diversity of the crowd. At the front, a massive, multi-colored banner read "Frontlines of Resistance, Forefront of Change," featuring an image of flooding on the left and people rising up on the right. Indigenous peoples and indigenous rights activists from the Americas and beyond came next, and differences across race, gender,

and background were highlighted in order to consciously bring out the diversity in the group. Next marched members of local community-based organizations working on a host of social and economic issues linked to climate justice. A housing rights organization carried large blue tents representing various kinds of displaced people. A group of environmental justice organizations struggling to protect nearby beach areas from the effects of flooding and sea level rise carried orange and blue dinghies with slogans such as "Organize Our Communities" and "Resistance & Resilience."

"We Can Build the Future" included labor, students, and youth. In this section a large contingent of students from colleges across the country marched under school-specific banners alongside union members carrying creative slogans such as "Tax Wall Street, End Climate Change," "Climate Change is a Healthcare Crisis," and "An Injury to the Planet is an Injury to All." Other marchers expressed more playful messages to get their points across, building on a long tradition of movement satire and humor (Bogad 2016, Haugerud 2014). The third large section in the March, "We Have Solutions," then passed by nearly three hours after the March had begun, and included various environmental movement groups and organizations. The most highly visible organized groups were large national and transnational environmental organizations, such as The Sierra Club, The Environmental Defense Fund, and the World Wildlife Federation. Several religious groups, including local Quaker and Insight Meditation organizations, also held large banners in the "We Have Solutions" block, pointing to another important movement sector.

Next came the "We Know Who is Responsible" section, including a visible presence of anti-corporate groups such as Rainforest Action Network, peace groups such as Code Pink and Veterans for Peace, Palestine solidarity groups stressing the ecological dimension of Israeli occupation, and the Flood Wall Street action contingent. This was largely an anti-capitalist bloc, which also featured many red and black-clad anarchists and occasional Guy Fawkes masks reminiscent of Occupy protests. Many of the critiques of the PCM for its corporate-friendly orientation (e.g., "hipsters and bankers in the same boat") were challenged by the radical images and slogans depicted in this block, such as the banner reading "Capitalism=Climate Chaos" that stretched an entire city block. Finally, the last two sections, "The Debate is Over" and "To Change Everything We Need Everyone" passed by relatively quickly, indicating their smaller numbers, perhaps in part because some had left the march prematurely after so many hours. The most memorable contingent from these two sections was the group of "scientists" decked out in white lab coats carrying signs with facts and figures documenting the reality of climate change and the urgency of immediate action.

As revealed in these snapshots, the PCM brought together much diversity while making visible and symbolically weaving together a complex set of issues, frames, discourses, and analyses under the broad umbrella of climate action. We were left with a lasting impression of the sheer immensity of the March. Beyond its size, this was one of the most diverse environmental marches we had ever

seen, including people from environmental justice and other community-based movements, indigenous activists from around the world, rank and file union members, students and other young people, representatives of large environmental organizations, anarchists and direct action activists, and thousands of unaffiliated people who had simply come to express their concern about climate change. Furthermore, the tone of the march was serious, given the gravity of the issue, but also festive, with creative art, colorful and witty signs, eye-catching banners and puppets, and myriad mobile performances. Though organizers originally put the total number of participants at 310,000, they increased the figure to 400,000. An older woman one of us spoke to beamed as she watched the protesters march by, saying, "I haven't seen anything like this since the 1960s!"

At around 3:30pm the PCM text alert system sent out a message saying, "The march is so big that we're asking people to disperse before they reach 11th Ave and 42nd St." Unlike other large marches there was no rally at the end of the PCM with a stage and speakers. As the text alert requested, the March dispersed, its participants spreading out around midtown in search of much needed water, food, and bathrooms. Though the March did not end with a bang, its impact had been made: it could no longer be said that no one cares about climate change. In this sense, the three main elements that constituted the PCM as a recursive public—its segmented but inclusive structure, its lack of a singular message, and the time spent waiting to start walking—all made it a critical public moment for the movement, allowing it to generate visibility, energy, and power, while consolidating a collective identity and feelings of attachment, despite some of the criticisms made in the weeks leading up to it. We again separated for the night to make our final preparations for the next day's Flood Wall Street direct action, which we turn to next.

Flood Wall Street: "Shut down Wall Street now"

> *"The people gonna rise with the water, gonna calm this crisis down.*
> *I hear the voice of my great-granddaughter, singing shut down Wall Street now."*

As we marched from Battery Park, organized into sections according to the expected risk of arrest, Flood Wall Street organizers led the crowd in song. Some had learned the song at FWS trainings, others had a song sheet handout, but most picked up the words piece by piece as we moved toward Wall Street, exchanging smiles with friends and strangers around us as the level of energy and excitement rose. The lyrics to the song (see epigraph) were carefully crafted by local poets prior to the protest to convey the main message FWS sought to convey. While the first line invokes the notions of crisis and sea level rise, the second line refers to both its impact on future generations and makes connections to Wall Street and capitalism. Throughout the day we sang the

song, voicing our message to onlookers and the world.

In contrast to the all-encompassing approach of the March itself, FWS had a distinct and direct message that shifted the discourse from "To Change Everything, We Need Everybody" to "Capitalism = Climate Chaos." Building on the political space created by the weekend, groups from around the country collaborated to plan and participate in the direct action, with the intention of engaging in nonviolent civil disobedience to disrupt the financial district around Wall Street. This was significant: during the PCM, there was mutual respect and collaboration between participants and organizers of both the March and FWS, representing mainstream and radical factions of the climate movement, respectively. This divide between approaches was central to the weakness of activism at Copenhagen, but was bridged, however momentarily, at the PCM. Most attendees at FWS happily marched in the main climate march the day before, and seemed to recognize the importance of participating despite their differences with some parts of the climate movement. The structure, framing, and tone of the PCM allowed it to be simultaneously inclusive of diverse movement participants and to project a unified public image to an external audience to address climate change. The recursivity of the PCM as a public—the constant debates, tensions, and micro-level struggles surrounding its component parts, boundaries, as well as its material and organizational conditions of possibility—paradoxically held the diverse segments of the movement together even as they publicly expressed their differences. Importantly, actions and performance bridged differences: the PCM created the physical and discursive space for wide swaths of the climate movement to be full members and to contribute. Some debates begun the day before continued at FWS, as participants found themselves with an abundance of time to interact with others. As we show in this section, FWS was essential to connecting some of the more contentious factions of the climate movement.

One of us had been preparing and planning to attend the PCM with a group in Boston, and noted a drastic change in excitement for the event when the group learned about FWS. For many who had been skeptical of the March for its lack of direct action, FWS was a good place to build on the March's energy and bring forth a radical message. Some in the Boston group felt that the proximity of these two events with different targets and purposes would move beyond frustrations with "flash-point organizing," (see Wengronowitz 2014). FWS allowed these types of activists to fully participate in the PCM weekend as a whole, which added ideological diversity to debates.

FWS was clearly linked to the March and similarly highlighted those most affected by climate change. It was organized in response to a call for action from the Climate Justice Alliance (CJA), a coalition of environmental justice, indigenous, and community based organizations like Grassroots Global Justice and Kentuckians for the Commonwealth. Attacking an "extractivist" mentality, CJA said their demands were simple: "Support us in building Just Transition pathways away from the 'dig, burn, dump' economy, and towards 'local, living economies' where communities and workers are in charge!" (Climate Justice

Alliance 2014). The call then asked for people to join in solidarity. Yotam Marom, one of the FWS organizers said the goal of the action "was to connect climate change to Wall Street and amplify stories from the front lines" (Flood Wall Street 2014). There were indigenous and frontline community members at FWS, some of whom spoke, but the action was largely a chance for the amplification of their message through a privileged, generally young and white group of activists.

Protesters met Monday morning in Battery Park at the Southern tip of Manhattan. Approximately two thousand people gathered at 10am, going over plans for the protest, discussing the events of the previous days, and squaring away contact information with lawyers and affinity group members in case of arrests. The connections to the PCM were clear. Not only did we personally recognize many of the people whom we had seen at events all weekend, the more performative aspects that had been present at the March also made an appearance in banners, costumes, and, perhaps most notably, two enormous inflated "climate bubbles" resembling black and silver beach balls. FWS also had its own plan to bridge the gap between performance and protest in asking all participants to wear blue, resembling a tide of people flooding the streets of lower Manhattan, and symbolizing the impact of rising sea levels.

When the action began around noon it quickly became apparent that things would not go exactly as planned. While we had originally intended to march from the Park down Broadway to Wall Street, the barricaded streets and enormous police presence in anticipation of the protest inhibited our movement forward. The march down Broadway was stopped about two blocks before Wall Street in the area surrounding the iconic Wall Street bull, a figure that had become a key image in the 2011 Occupy protests. Police gathered in the barricaded area surrounding the bull soon captured the huge climate bubbles, deflating them amid a cry of jeers and boos from the crowd. While the image of heavily armed police deflating the art pieces as if they posed a threat injected some levity into the scene, a tense energy intermingled with the laughter as protesters watched the officers pop the bubbles one at a time.

When it became clear that we would not march any closer to Wall Street, organizers directed the group to sit down in the street space surrounding the bull. High risk protesters sat down, while low risk protesters moved closer to the sidewalks and assisted in unfurling the 75 foot banner that had also been present at the March the day before, which proclaimed in bright lettering, "Capitalism = Climate Chaos, Flood Wall St!" To our surprise the police did not immediately move from their positions behind the barricades to arrest the crowds sitting in the middle of a central artery for city traffic. As it turned out, the entire afternoon passed without officers arresting protesters, possibly due to the large numbers they would have to arrest. We occupied the area of Broadway for four more hours.

While a prolonged occupation was not part of the original plan, this time provided space for dialogue. A gradual calm spread throughout the crowd as we realized that we would not be moved or arrested. The streets became a space for

casual conversation, speechmaking, petition signing, and discussion about what would come next. The barricades police had erected to separate those in the street from those on the sidewalk were disconnected, many by participants, opening space for people to move in and out of the protest as they wished. Organizers started using the "people's mic" to convey messages to the large crowd, the participatory and non-amplified mode of communication popularized by the Occupy Wall Street demonstrations. Participants, one at a time, stood and called out "mic check!" to claim attention for a chance to speak publicly. Though the method of public speech was equally accessible on the face of it, it was not always equitable.

At one point, a young white man grabbed attention with a ranting speech in which he provoked police from his perch on a phone booth, prompting them to chase and tackle him. Several activists voiced frustration that this man had been able to take up so much discursive and media space without being representative of the peaceful and respectful masses. Lisa Fithian, a well-known long-time activist reclaimed the people's mic. In a moment indicative of the weekend's recursivity because of its concern with its own construction and practices, she proposed that those of us in the street turn to the people around us and discuss the pervasiveness of white and male privilege in the climate movement. For the next hour we sat in small groups in the middle of the street, surrounding the famous Wall Street bull and its symbolism of the dominance of economic markets, and discussed the effects of privilege and oppression in the climate movement.

The protest continued for hours, opening up space for businesspeople, tourists, and others to engage with the participants, further showing how incidental context of a protest can have important influence. Throughout the afternoon, interested onlookers wandered in and out of the protests to take a look at what was going on and question participants about the intentions of the action. When businesspeople came down from their offices many engaged with the protesters about their anti-capitalist messages. Though we heard many heated arguments, including those with a group of young men in business suits who sought to provoke by bringing a cardboard cutout of Ronald Reagan, there were also productive conversations about the connection between capitalism and climate change. Some onlookers were deeply supportive, including a group of students at an adjacent school who held signs up to the windows saying they would join after class. Many non-participants were also tourists, who wound their way through protesters in the streets to take photographs with the Wall Street bull and costumed FWS activists. As we occupied the street, we debated among ourselves whether we could consider FWS a success. This sparked intense discussion, for example, about the definitions of a successful action, the nature of disruption, and the significance of the NYPD's non-interference and even accommodation—was it because of numbers, a relatively friendly mayor (Bill de Blasio), or something else?

As it became increasingly apparent that there would not be a climactic ending to the protest, people began to trickle away from the action after a long afternoon

of physically occupying the streets near Wall Street. It concluded in the evening, however, with the arrest of 104 activists in an act of civil disobedience—they refused to follow a police order to disperse from the street which they had occupied for many hours at this point. Conversations amongst activists continued during the arrests and legal processing. One of us was arrested and recalls dialogue amongst arrestees about the prison system, New York City politics, and the next steps for the movement, particularly for the group of approximately 25 Boston-based organizers (some who continued the conversation online, see Emily et. al 2014). Though the FWS action did not meet its original stated goal of marching on Wall Street itself, it was certainly disruptive to foot and automobile traffic in the financial district. It also produced a space for recursive discourse about the nature and conditions of possibility of the climate movement: friends and strangers alike filled the time with lively discussions about what climate justice means, who needs to be a part of the movement, and what it would take to get there. Moreover, through its performative actions—with the collective described as a "sea," pointing to Manhattan's high-risk of flooding with sea level rise—the protest attempted to make visible the causal connections between capitalism and climate change, conveying a political message to an external audience, while embodying and constituting itself as the radical wing of a larger recursive climate movement public.

At one point earlier in the day during the protest, one of us stepped out into a nearby café. Inside, Fox News was playing on a television, and the anchor made a statement to the effect of, "The People's Climate March continues today with protests on Wall Street." While this first seemed like an inaccurate portrayal of the intentions of the protest, we then realized that the anchor had made the connection between capitalism and climate change, using the less controversial PCM to frame their brief coverage. The attention that FWS drew to this connection is notable, and was made possible by the PCM's magnetic power to attract people to New York that weekend and thereby create an undeniable demonstration of strength of the climate movement. The PCM had thus brought into being and embodied a large, diverse, and highly visible recursive climate movement public that had succeeded in reaching out to and conveying its messages to a massive internal and external public audience.

Conclusion: marches, publics, and climate movement strategy

We have argued in this paper that the PCM weekend was a critical moment in the climate movement because it provided the spatial and organizational infrastructure to bring together a diversity of historically fragmented climate movement actors as an embodied recursive public that reached a large internal and external audience, setting the stage for subsequent organizing, strategizing, and movement building. This recursivity did not exist solely in the planning of the March weekend between select movement leaders, but it was also enacted and performed by all the participants. Woven through the March weekend, and often happening in real-time, were debates and discussions about the nature,

composition, and future of the climate movement, including its potential as well as the most effective narratives and strategies going forward. This made the March distinct from past actions that were not able to bring together so many diverse actors in a coordinated process of communication and interaction across social, political, and ideological differences.

Recursivity and the notion of an embodied recursive public have been central to our analysis. We have shown that the March weekend was a series of events rooted in the inclusion of diverse viewpoints about how to address climate change and how best to build a movement, and in this, dialogue and debate were facilitated throughout the entire mobilization. An important part of these discussions was that individuals and groups came to the March weekend as full participants, regardless of their background or perspective, due in no small part to the visibility and foregrounding of historically marginalized groups. Despite differences in their analysis of climate change and political strategy, activists of all stripes felt that they belonged in New York City on that long September weekend. By being there, with other participants, with different perspectives, they were building the movement. This is tied to the features of the PCM, which - both intentionally and unintentionally—provided abundant space and time to debate the climate movement.

We identified five factors that contributed to the constitution of the PCM as an embodied recursive public: 1) The segmented structure of the PCM and its unbranded nature facilitated participation from a broad set of perspectives and allowed for diverse forms of protest performance; 2) Because the March had no target, participants were able to publicly express and articulate their own ideas on climate change to internal and external audiences; 3) At the pre-March events, an open-source model of workshops, panels, and meetups allowed wide-ranging activists to find their place, debate ideas about the movement and its conditions of possibility, and make connections; 4) The opportunity for direct action at Flood Wall Street, facilitated by the March weekend, provided an outlet for more radically-minded activists to perform and communicate their visions of capitalism, climate, and the nature, composition, and prospects for the broader movement; and finally, 5) The incidental moments—including the delayed start of the PCM and the extended occupation at FWS—provided further spaces for groups and individuals to interact, communicate, and connect.

Ultimately, the March weekend was one event in the history and course of the climate movement. We must ask ourselves, then, what the March weekend as the embodiment of a recursive public represented for the movement, and what did recursivity accomplish? We believe the PCM created an infrastructure for the diverse sectors of the movement to come together, talk about and debate the underlying politics, vision, and goals of the March, while embodying and performing the relationships between the different sectors of the movement, providing a snapshot of a broadly diverse movement coming together across its differences. The horizontal, network structure of the march facilitated this kind of relatively horizontal discursive production, interaction, and performance.

Recursivity depends on this kind of horizontal, networked organization.

The March, then, allowed the movement to come together, interact, project an image of itself as large, powerful, and diverse, but also unified. Such recursivity helps to produce the infrastructure and the conditions of possibility for future coordination, organization, and decision-making, as well as the generation of demands and the organization of actions to achieve those demands. In other words, the radical critiques of the march were in part wrong—the march was so large and successful because it did not include demands, facilitating instead spaces for diverse groups to come together across their differences. But the march could not do other things that are important for movements, such as building sustainable relationships, generating specific demands, organizing locally, and fighting for concrete legislation. In this sense, recursivity serves only as a precondition, local movements and networks then have to engage more fully in deliberative kinds of interactions that can lead to local and regional decisions being made and implemented. This requires more organized kinds of structures and processes within movement organizations. The march did not and could not do this. Its recursivity and constitution as an embodied recursive public were only preconditions.

Finally, our analysis here also raises the important question of praxis. Praxis is the movement of theory into practice, and it has an important relationship with a movement's recursivity and reflexivity. The March weekend had elements of praxis, reflexivity, and recursivity all at varying stages throughout the weekend. For example, FWS had strong elements of praxis as it put theories of capitalism, political economy, and environmental destruction into conversation and action through a climate change-focused march on Wall Street. At the same time the action was both reflexive and recursive. It was reflexive in that the action's impacts were continually and constantly re-evaluated, such as when the decision was made to push forward from the location around the Wall Street bull to Wall Street itself. It was also recursive in its internal debate about the conditions of possibility of this more radical faction of the climate movement, such as when participants sat down in the street to discuss privilege, and in its debates about the position of the radical faction within the larger movement. At the same time, the action was also performative, in that it publicly communicated its values and politics to internal and external audiences. These elements are distinct but interrelated, and we argue that taken together the embodiment and enactment of recursivity during the weekend brought into a being a large and highly visible recursive public, unifying a broader movement across its myriad differences, even if momentarily, and creating the conditions of possibility for ongoing movement organizing, strategizing, protesting, and movement building. In this sense, the PCM mobilization was a critical moment for the climate movement, which will need to grow stronger as well as more visible and active in the context of a Trump regime that includes high-profile climate change deniers, oil company executives, and opponents of the EPA.

The concepts of recursivity and recursive publics illuminate what was special about the PCM weekend. Examining recursivity allowed us to see how people

who are not typically participants in strategic discussions within the climate movement became involved in meaningful ways. For a climate movement intent on drawing activists working on wide-ranging issues and finding ways for activists to work together across ideological divides, or at least articulating, discussing, and performing their differences together is valuable. We suggest that future research on the degree and importance of recursivity and recursive publics in social movements could produce important insights into cross-disciplinary understandings of resiliency, longevity, and strategies of large-scale grassroots movements.

The utility of recursivity and recursive publics as concepts for movement research can be seen in relation to three longstanding debates among activists and within social movement theory: the role of non-profit organizations in campaigns, strategic debates between mainstream (liberal) and radical approaches, and the utility of mass marches. These issues were not resolved, but as we have shown the PCM weekend afforded spaces where groups and individuals could engage in productive debate and dialogue. Critical conversations about the movement's future were not reserved for movement leaders alone, but included activists and everyday supporters. The March weekend showed the potential for how a broadly participatory and actively recursive public event can contribute to a stronger movement more aware and intentional about its own construction and organizing practices. Such a movement can be united in its diversity, but the mere presence of diversity does not unite a movement. By fostering the conditions that generated an embodied recursive public, an effort that took a significant amount of political and organizational labor, PCM organizers helped lay the foundations for ongoing climate organizing and movement building across differences—in background, social composition, ideology, tactics, and strategy.

References

Arnold, N. Scott. 2009. Imposing Values: An Essay on Liberalism and Regulation. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Bell, Erica, Bastian Seidel, and Sue Kilpatrick. 2013. "Climate Change: How Scientism Has Neutralised Health Policy Effectiveness for Rural Communities." *Journal of Rural Studies* 32:365–74.

Bogad, L. M. 2016. *Tactical Performance: The Theory and Practice of Serious Play*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Boykoff, Maxwell. 2011. *Who speaks for the climate?: Making sense of media reporting on climate change*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Chatterton, Paul, David Featherstone, and Paul Routledge. 2013. "Articulating Climate Justice in Copenhagen: Antagonism, the Commons, and Solidarity." *Antipode* 45(3):602–20.

Ciplet, David, J. Timmons Roberts, and Mizan Khan. 2015. Power in a Warming World: The Global Politics of Climate Change and the Remaking of

Environmental Inequality. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Climate Justice Alliance. 2014. "People's Climate March and People's Climate Justice Summit. Take Direct Action for Climate Justice." http://www.ourpowercampaign.org/peoplesclimatemarch/ (Accessed September 25, 2014).

Cohen, Daniel Aldana. 2017. "Petro Gotham, People's Gotham." Pp. 47–54 in The City is the Factory: Social Movements in the Age of Neoliberal Urbanism, edited by M. Greenberg and P. Luce. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Emily et al. 2014. "Beyond the People's Climate March: Where Were You During the #Flood?" Tar Sands Blockade. http://www.tarsandsblockade.org/beyond_floodwallst/ (Accessed 27, 2014).

Endres, Danielle, Tracylee Clarke, Autumn Garrison, and Tarla Rai Peterson. 2009. "Toward Just Climate-Change Coalitions: Challenges and Possibilities in the Step It Up 2007 Campaign." Pp. 179–209 in Social movement to address climate change: local steps for global action, Politics, institutions, and public policy in America, edited by D. Endres, L. M. Sprain, and T. R. Peterson. Amherst, N.Y: Cambria Press.

Evans, Sara M. and Harry C. Boyte. 1992. *Free spaces: The sources of democratic change in America*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Flood Wall Street. 2014. "Media." http://floodwallstreet.net/media/ (Accessed January 31, 2016).

Guha, Ramachandra and Joan Martinez-Alier. 2013. *Varieties of Environmentalism: Essays North and South*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Gupta, Arun. 2014 September 19. "How the People's Climate March Became a Corporate PR Campaign." CounterPunch. http://www.counterpunch.org/2014/09/19/how-the-peoples-climate-march-became-a-corporate-pr-campaign/# (Accessed September 22, 2014).

Haylock, Sean. 2015. "Climate Change and Scientism." *Quadrant* 59(7/8):74-76.

Hedges, Chris. 2014. August 31. "The Last Gasp of Climate Change Liberals: Chris Hedges." Truthdig. http://www.truthdig.com/report/item/the_last_gasp_of_climate_change_libe rals_20140831 (Accessed September 3, 2014).

Juris, Jeffrey S. 2008a. *Networking futures: The movements against corporate globalization*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Juris, Jeffrey S. 2008b. "Performing Politics: Image, Embodiment, and Affective Solidarity during Anti-Corporate Globalization Protests." *Ethnography* 9(1):61–97.

Juris, Jeffrey S. and Alex Khasnabish, eds. 2013. *Insurgent Encounters: Transnational Activism, Ethnography, and the Political*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Kelty, Christopher M. 2008. *Two Bits: The Cultural Significance of Free*

Software. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Kendall, Henry et al. 1992. "1992 World Scientists' Warning to Humanity." http://www.ucsusa.org/about/1992-world-scientists.html (Accessed December 24, 2013).

Kinsella, William J. and Robert Cox. 2009. "SIU and beyond: Challenges of Scale and the Strategic." Pp. 393–422 in Social movement to address climate change: local steps for global action, Politics, institutions, and public policy in America, edited by D. Endres, L. M. Sprain, and T. R. Peterson. Amherst, N.Y: Cambria Press.

Martinez-Alier, Juan. 2003. *The Environmentalism of the Poor: A Study of Ecological Conflicts and Valuation*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

McKibben, Bill. 2014 May 21. "A Call to Arms: An Invitation to Demand Action on Climate Change." Rolling Stone. http://www.rollingstone.com/politics/news/a-call-to-arms-an-invitation-to-demand-action-on-climate-change-20140521 (Accessed May 26, 2014).

Moore, Kelly, Kleinman, Daniel L., Hess, David., & Frickel, Scott. 2011. Science and neoliberal globalization: a political sociological approach. *Theory and Society* 40 (5):505-32.

Mukhopadhyay, Arun G. 2009. Climate Climax: Post-Copenhagen Reflections on "The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time." Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network. http://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=1528708 (Accessed October 25, 2015).

Olivera, Oscar. 2004. Cochabamba!: Water War in Bolivia. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Petermann, Anne. 2014 August 13. "The Need for Clear Demands at the Peoples' Climate March." Daily Kos. http://www.dailykos.com/story/2014/08/13/1321335/-The-Need-for-Clear-Demands-at-the-Peoples-Climate-March (Accessed October 25, 2015).

Polletta, Francesca. 1999. "'Free spaces" in collective action." *Theory and Society* 28:1-38.

Routledge, Paul. 2003. "Convergence Space: Process Geographies of Grassroots Globalization." Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers 28:333-49.

Robbins, Patrick. 2014 September 12. "Occupy & the Climate March." The Indypendent. https://www.indypendent.org/2014/09/12/occupy-climate-march (Accessed November 8, 2015).

Salamon, Margaret Klein. 2014 September 11. "Demands for the People's Climate March—and Beyond; Introducing the Pledge To Mobilize." The Climate Mobilization. http://www.theclimatemobilization.org/we_can_give_the_people_s_climate_march_demands_introducing_the_pledge_to_mobilize (Accessed November 8, 2015).

Saul, Quincy. 2014 September 16. "Why the People's Climate March Won't Stop Climate Change (And 5 Ways to Go Further)." YES! Magazine, http://www.yesmagazine.org/climate-in-our-hands/why-the-people-s-climate-march-won-t-stop-climate-change (Accessed November 8, 2015).

Scheper-Hughes, Nancy. 1993. Death without Weeping: The Violence of Everyday Life in Brazil. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Warner, Michael. 2002. "Publics and Counterpublics (Abbreviated Version)." Quarterly Journal of Speech. 88(4): 413-425.

Wengronowitz, Bobby. 2014 September 18. "Letter on the People's Climate March." *Open Media Boston*. http://www.openmediaboston.org/content/letter-peoples-climate-march-3018 (Accessed September 24, 2014).

Zibechi, Raúl. 2005. "Subterranean Echoes: Resistance and Politics, desde el Sótano." Socialism and Democracy. 19(3):13-39.

About the Authors

Danielle Falzon is a PhD student in the Department of Sociology at Brown University, studying the dynamics of development and climate change policy-making. She has led and participated in numerous campaigns on energy and environmental issues. danielle_falzon AT brown.edu

Samuel Maron is a PhD student in Sociology at Northeastern University. He has participated in many campaigns for social and environmental justice. His research is focused on transnational social movements, cross-cultural solidarity activism, globalization, and the Olympic Games. maron.s AT husky.neu.edu

Robert Wengronowitz is a PhD candidate in the Department of Sociology at Boston College. He is an organizer in several climate movement groups that also form the basis of his dissertation research. bobbywego AT gmail.com

Alex Press is a PhD student in sociology at Northeastern University. Her research focuses on globalization and urban development. press.a AT husky.neu.edu

Ben Levy is a PhD student in sociology at Northeastern University. His research focuses on political sociology and social movement studies. levy.ben AT husky.neu.edu

Jeffrey Juris is an Associate Professor of Anthropology at Northeastern University. He examines the issues, strategies, and tactics that inspire and shape emerging forms of radical social movement activism. He has carved out a militant ethnographic approach that challenges the divide between activist and researcher. j.juris AT neu.edu